

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On page 2 of the Official Action, claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by Mercier, US 6,865,747. In reply, claims 1-2 have been cancelled.

On page 4 of the Official Action, claim 4 was rejected as obvious from Mercier. Applicants respectfully traverse, and request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. It is true that transitioning from pause mode to normal play mode would have been obvious and necessitated in Mercier. In addition, Mercier in col. 10 lines 28-31 refers to “the possibility to generate a valid MPEG-2 elementary video stream, with a valid number of frames per second (29.97 for NTSC for example).” Applicants’ claim 4, however, recites: “when a resume is requested, a seamless transition is made to playing of the MPEG coded video stream beginning with the I frame selected from the MPEG coded video stream.” (Emphasis added.) Seamless transitioning from pause mode to normal play is more than a possibility of creating a valid MPEG-2 elementary stream by resuming normal play. From applicants’ specification (e.g., page 21, lines 7-8, and page 21 line 19 to page 22 line 4, and page 23 line 15 to page 25 line 14, with reference to FIGS. 4-6, and page 67, lines 5-13, with reference to FIG. 26A), seamless transitioning from pause mode to normal play requires management of the video buffer to ensure the absence of objectionable video artifacts. It is respectfully submitted that Mercier neither recognizes a problem of objectionable video artifacts when transitioning from pause mode to normal play, nor teaches how to solve this problem by seamless splicing.

On page 4 of the Official Action, claims 3 and 5-19 were indicated as allowable if re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. In reply claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 17, and 19 have been re-written in independent form, including their base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 9, 10, and 11, 13, and 14 are dependent upon claim 8, claim 12 is dependent upon claim 11, claim 16 is dependent upon claim 15, and claim 18 is dependent upon claim 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration is respectfully requested, and early allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Auchterlonie
Reg. No. 30,607

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP
1000 Louisiana, 53rd Floor
Houston, TX 77002
713-751-0655